1

2

4

3

5

67

8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

18 19

2021

2223

24

25

2627

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

W.O., a minor, by and through her guardian ad litem, SHANNA OVERCAST,

Plaintiff,

Tamen

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and DOES 1-100,

VS.

Defendants.

CASE NO. 10 CV 0632 MMA (RBB)

ORDER DISMISSING PLAINTIFF'S ACTION WITHOUT PREJUDICE FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE

Plaintiff W.O., a minor proceeding through her guardian ad litem, Shanna Overcast, initiated this action on March 24, 2010 for injuries she allegedly sustained while visiting Fort Rosecrans National Cemetery when a tombstone collapsed on her leg and ankle. [Doc. No. 1.] On August 18, 2011, Frantz Law Group filed a motion to withdraw as Plaintiff's counsel of record. [Doc. No. 51.] Ms. Overcast consented to the firm's request to withdraw. [*Id.* ¶6.] On September 21, 2011, the Court granted Frantz Law Group's motion to withdraw, and granted Ms. Overcast 30 days to obtain new counsel.¹ [Doc. No. 56.] On October 19, 2011, Ms. Overcast filed an *ex parte* application requesting additional time to retain an attorney. [Doc. No. 58.] The Court granted Ms. Overcast's request on October 20, 2011, giving her an additional 60 days to retain counsel.

- 1 - 10cv632

¹ In cases such as this where a minor is proceeding by and through a guardian ad litem, the guardian cannot proceed pro se and must be represented by counsel. *Gulbransen v. Far N. Reg'l Ctr.*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 64745 *3-4 (E.D. Cal. Jun. 17, 2011).

Case 3:10-cv-00632-MMA-RBB Document 64 Filed 01/25/12 PageID.350 Page 2 of 2

Ms. Overcast's time to retain new counsel has expired. The Court twice cautioned Ms.

Overcast that if new counsel did not file a notice of appearance within the time permitted, the

Court may dismiss her action without further notice. [Doc. Nos. 56, 59.] Although public policy
generally favors disposition of cases on their merits, a case cannot move forward toward resolution
on the merits when the plaintiff's conduct impedes or completely prevents progress in that
direction. See, e.g., Hernandez v. City of El Monte, 138 F.3d 393, 399 (9th Cir. 1998); In re Eisen,
31 F.3d 1447, 1454 (9th Cir. 1994).

Accordingly, upon due consideration, and given the procedural posture of this case, the
Court hereby DISMISSES the above-captioned action WITHOUT PREJUDICE. The Clerk of
Court is instructed to close the case file.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: January 25, 2012

How Mishael M. Applle.

Hon. Michael M. Anello United States District Judge

- 2 - 10cv632